

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

GRANT #'s N00014-95-1-0732 and N00014-95-WR-20027

R&T Codes 3133037---06 and 4133038

Technical Report No. 4

**High Pressure Electrical Conductivity and NMR Studies In  
Variable Equivalent Weight NAFION Membranes**

John J. Fontanella, Charles A. Edmondson, Mary C. Wintersgill,  
Yaobang Wu and Steven G. Greenbaum

Prepared for Publication in

*Macromolecules*

Hunter College of CUNY  
Department of Physics  
New York, NY 10021

and

U.S. Naval Academy  
Department of Physics  
Annapolis, MD 21402

January 26, 1996

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

This document has been approved for public release and sale:  
its distribution is unlimited.

19960228 079

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data source gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of the collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED		
	January 26, 1996	Interim Technical Report		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE		5. FUNDING NUMBERS		
High Pressure Electrical Conductivity and NMR Studies of Variable Equivalent Weight NAFION Membranes		Grant #'s N00014-95-1-0732 & N00014-95-WR-20027 R&T Codes 3133037---06 & 4133038		
6. AUTHOR(S)		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
J. J. Fontanella, C. A. Edmondson, M. C. Wintersgill Y. Wu and S. G. Greenbaum		4		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		
Hunter College of CUNY, Dept. of Physics 695 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10021 U.S. Naval Academy, Dept. of Physics Annapolis, MD 21402		Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5660		
		10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
Submitted for publication in macromolecules.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE		
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.				
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)				
Measurements of the electrical conductivity and proton and fluorine-19 NMR spin-lattice relaxation times ( $T_1$ ) in acid form NAFION 105, 117 and 120 conditioned at various levels of relative humidity have been carried out. Complex impedance studies were made along the plane of the polymer film at frequencies from 10 to $10^8$ Hz at room temperature and pressures up to 0.25 GPa. Both types of measurement were also carried out on various concentrations of sulfuric acid in water. The electrical conductivity decreases with increasing pressure for low water content acid solutions and low water content NAFION samples. This behavior (positive activation volume) is that expected for "normal" liquids and for ions in polymers where the motion of the ions is determined by the host matrix. However, for high water contents, the reverse is true. The electrical conductivity increases with increasing pressure which gives rise to a negative activation volume. The results show that at high water contents, the electrical conductivity mechanism in NAFION is essentially identical to that for a dilute acid where the transport is controlled by the aqueous component. The activation volumes extracted from the proton NMR $T_1$ data are in qualitative agreement with those obtained from the electrical conductivity measurements at intermediate and low water contents, suggesting that motion of the sulfonic acid-terminated pendant chains contribute to the conduction mechanism at low water contents.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS		15. NUMBER OF PAGES		
NAFION, high pressure conductivity, NMR, transport mechanism				
		16. PRICE CODE		
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT		18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
unclassified		unclassified	unclassified	UL

*Macromolecules*  
*subm. Hcd*

**HIGH PRESSURE ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY AND NMR STUDIES IN  
VARIABLE EQUIVALENT WEIGHT NAFION MEMBRANES**

J. J. Fontanella, C. A. Edmondson, M. C. Wintersgill

Physics Department

U.S. Naval Academy

Annapolis, MD 21402-5026, USA

and

Y. Wu and S. G. Greenbaum

Physics Department

Hunter College of CUNY

New York, NY 10021

**Keywords:** Nafion, Electrical Conductivity, Nuclear Magnetic Resonance,  
Transport Mechanism, Activation Volume, High Pressure

## ABSTRACT

Measurements of the electrical conductivity and proton and fluorine-19 NMR spin-lattice relaxation times ( $T_1$ ) in acid form NAFION 105, 117 and 120 conditioned at various levels of relative humidity have been carried out. Complex impedance studies were made along the plane of the polymer film at frequencies from 10 to  $10^8$  Hz at room temperature and pressures up to 0.3 GPa. The NMR measurements were made at room temperature and pressures up to 0.25 GPa. Both types of measurement were also carried out on various concentrations of sulfuric acid in water. The electrical conductivity decreases with increasing pressure for low water content acid solutions and low water content NAFION samples. This behavior (positive activation volumes) is that expected for "normal" liquids and for ions in polymers where the motion of the ions is determined by the host matrix. However, for high water contents, the reverse is true. The electrical conductivity increases with increasing pressure which gives rise to a negative activation volume. The results show that at high water contents, the electrical conductivity mechanism in NAFION is essentially identical to that for a dilute acid where the transport is controlled by the aqueous component. The activation volumes extracted from the proton NMR  $T_1$  data are in qualitative agreement with those obtained from the electrical conductivity measurements at intermediate and low water contents, suggesting that motion of the sulfonic acid-terminated pendant chains contribute to the conduction mechanism at low water contents.

## INTRODUCTION

Because of their possible application in fuel cells, the electrical conductivity of ion exchange membranes such as NAFION is of interest. While many studies of the electrical conductivity in these types of material have been carried out [1-14], relatively little work has been reported on the effect of high pressure on the conductivity. Molecular motions and ionic diffusion are associated with volume fluctuations that can be probed directly by employing pressure (rather than temperature) as the thermodynamic variable. Understanding of the proton transport mechanism in NAFION can be greatly facilitated by investigating these volume fluctuations. In a previous paper, the authors have presented some results for the effect of high pressure on the electrical conductivity and proton, deuteron and oxygen-17 NMR spin-lattice relaxation times ( $T_1$ ) of NAFION 117 [12]. and in another paper, further measurements on NAFION 117 were reported along with measurements on other molecular weight materials [13]. As pointed out in the latter paper, it was of interest to carry out the electrical conductivity measurements on higher water content material. Those experiments have been completed and the results are reported in the present paper. In addition,  $^1H$  and  $^{19}F$   $T_1$  data are presented, the former as a probe of water molecular motion and the latter reflecting relaxations of the main polymer and pendant chains.

## EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

All studies were carried out on NAFION 105, 117 and 120 forms of NAFION manufactured by E. I. DuPont de Nemours. Under dry conditions, the NAFION 117, 105 and 120 samples are approximately 0.17, 0.145 and 0.26 mm thick, respectively and their respective repeat unit equivalent weights are 1000, 1100 and 1200.

For the electrical conductivity studies of NAFION, the samples were approximately 4 cm long and 1 cm wide. Gold was vacuum evaporated onto the ends of the sample. The gold completely covered the ends of the sample (both sides and edges) leaving a strip of NAFION approximately 3 cm long and 1 cm wide. This configuration has been shown to give good agreement with the bulk conductivity reported by other workers [4].

For the atmospheric pressure measurements, the samples were placed in sealed jars containing saturated solutions of various salts to control the relative humidity. The ends of the samples were connected to alligator clips attached to the ends of electrical feed-throughs which were epoxied into the lid of the jar. All samples were pretreated as described previously [4]. In each case the samples were dried over phosphorous pentoxide then successively conditioned at about 15, 25, 45, 75 and 100% relative humidities using saturated solutions as described above. The atmosphere in a glove box was also adjusted to each relative humidity using the saturated solutions and measurements of the dimensions and mass of the samples were carried out in the glove box. The wt-% of water in the samples for the atmospheric pressure measurements was calculated by dividing the change in mass by the mass of the dry samples.

For the high pressure electrical conductivity measurements, both the liquid and solid samples were isolated from the pressure fluid (Spinesstic 22) using techniques similar to those recently applied to gel electrolytes [15]. Briefly, the samples were sealed inside rubber tubing and then clamped onto the closure plug of a high pressure vessel. In the case of the liquid samples, 1/8 inch i.d. viton tubing about 5 cm long was used and stainless steel plugs were used in the ends of the tubing. In the case of the solid materials, four terminal measurements were carried out for one sample ( $\lambda=10$  NAFION 117).

The equivalent parallel capacitance and resistance of the samples were determined using a CGA-83 Capacitance bridge (10-10<sup>5</sup> Hz) and/or a Hewlett Packard 4194A Impedance/Gain-Phase Analyzer. All data were then transformed to the complex impedance,  $Z^* = Z' - jZ''$ .

For <sup>1</sup>H NMR measurements, the samples were tightly sealed in Teflon ® tape immediately after determining their water uptake, and Fluorinert FC-72 (3M Company) was employed as the pressure transmitting fluid. Both the Teflon and Fluorinert were checked for absence of appreciable <sup>1</sup>H NMR signals. Proton T<sub>1</sub>'s were measured by inversion recovery at a Larmor frequency of 39 MHz, with a typical inverting pulse width of 10  $\mu$ s. The variable pressure measurements on the acid solutions were accomplished by putting a small amount ( $\approx 10 \mu$ l) of liquid into a two-piece Teflon piston-type cell. For <sup>19</sup>F T<sub>1</sub> measurements, also conducted at 39 MHz, the samples were sealed in a polyurethane rubber sheath and Spinesstic 22 was utilized as the pressure transmitting fluid. [Some effects of pressure history were observed, in particular a slight decrease in activation volume (up to about 25%) after one or two pressure cycles.???] For consistency, all T<sub>1</sub>'s reported correspond to the decreasing pressure portion of the first cycle.

## RESULTS

### Electrical Conductivity vs. Water Content

Typical results for the electrical studies of NAFION are shown in Figure 1 in the form of complex impedance diagrams. In general, an impedance arc, attributable to the bulk properties of the material, is observed at the highest frequencies. In addition, a slanted line, due to electrode effects, is observed at the lowest frequencies. Because of the wide range of conductivity of the samples and different capabilities of the measuring instruments, different portions of the arc

or line are observed for different samples at different water contents and pressures.

The data exhibit a slightly depressed semicircular arc, similar to that seen in other ion conducting polymers [16]. This is consistent with the observation by various groups [4,11] that the electrical conductivity is attributable to a simple, frequency independent conductivity mechanism. In the present work, all intercepts due to semicircular arcs were obtained graphically. The intercept of the impedance data with the Z' axis was taken to be the bulk resistance, R, of the sample. The conductance, G=1/R, was then calculated from the intercept and transformed to the electrical conductivity,  $\sigma$ , via:

$$\sigma = G\ell/A. \quad (1)$$

where A is the area of the sample and  $\ell$  is the length.

The results for the variation of the electrical conductivity with water content are shown in Figure 2. The results represent several different samples and most of the data from reference 13 are also included there. (Two of the datum points from reference 13 are not included.) While NAFION 105 tends to exhibit a slightly higher conductivity, the different equivalent weight samples are almost indistinguishable when the conductivity data is plotted vs. wt-% of water. However, for a given value of  $\lambda$ , which is the number of waters per sulfonate ion, the electrical conductivity is highest for NAFION 105 and lowest for NAFION 120.

### **Electrical Conductivity vs. Pressure**

Because of the steps required for loading the NAFION samples into the rubber tubing, it was possible that the water content of the sample could change during the process. Consequently, the electrical conductivity of the sample while

it was inside the tubing was used to estimate the water content. The procedure was to calculate the electrical conductivity at approximately atmospheric pressure then determine the water content from the empirical line shown in Figure 3 of reference 13. Consequently, the water content reported in Table I represent indirect, albeit *in situ*, values.

Typical results for the variation of the electrical conductance with pressure are shown in Figure 3. As previously reported, the electrical conductance decreases with increasing pressure for low water content materials [12,13]. However, for high water content the behavior is opposite i.e. the slope is positive. The values of the pressure variation of the conductance were calculated from best-fits to the data and the results are given in Table I. The results for the various water/H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> solutions are listed in Table II.

Next, the pressure derivative of the electrical conductance was converted to pressure derivative of the electrical conductivity using:

$$\left( \frac{\partial \ln \sigma}{\partial p} \right)_T = \left( \frac{\partial \ln G}{\partial p} \right)_T + \frac{\chi_T}{3} \quad (2)$$

where  $\chi_T$  is the isothermal compressibility. For the polymer at low water content, a value of  $\chi_T=0.3/\text{GPa}$  was used which is slightly larger than the value given for poly(tetrafluoroethylene) [17]. However, for the high water content polymer and for the aqueous solutions of sulfuric acid a value of  $\chi_T=0.45/\text{GPa}$ , which is the value for water [18].

Finally, an activation volume was calculated from the pressure variation of the electrical conductivity via:

$$\Delta V = -kT [d \ln \sigma / dp]_T. \quad (3)$$

The results NAFION are given in Table 1 and are plotted in Figures 4. The new and interesting feature, of course, is that at high water content the activation volume for NAFION is negative. The results for the water/H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> solutions are listed in Table II.

### NMR vs. Pressure

In water-containing NAFION at room temperature, the so-called fast motion approximation, namely  $\omega\tau_c \ll 1$ , can be employed, where  $\omega$  is the Larmor frequency and  $\tau_c$  is the motional correlation time [19]. In this regime the spin-lattice relaxation time 1/T<sub>1</sub> is proportional to  $\tau_c$  and the activation volume for spin-lattice relaxation is given approximately by:

$$\Delta V = -kT [d\ln T_1/dp]_T. \quad (3)$$

Figure 6 displays T<sub>1</sub> vs. pressure data for NAFION 105 (Figure 6a), NAFION 117 (6b) and NAFION 120 (6c), for films with varying amounts of water. Least-squares straight-line fits to the data yield activation volumes that are listed in Table III and also plotted in Figure 4, ~~along with the conductivity activation~~ ~~volumes~~. The <sup>19</sup>F T<sub>1</sub> vs. pressure results are shown in Figure 7, again for NAFION 105 (Figure 7a), NAFION 117 (7b) and NAFION 120 (7c). Because of substantial scatter within the very small variation of <sup>19</sup>F T<sub>1</sub> vs. pressure, the corresponding activation volumes are not regarded as significantly different from zero.

For comparison with the <sup>1</sup>H NMR results for NAFION, T<sub>1</sub> vs pressure data for two different water/H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> solutions, corresponding to  $\lambda=5$  and  $\lambda=2$ , are displayed in Figure 8. Again, because of the small fluctuations of the data about approximately zero slope, the activation volumes for water/H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> solutions are

regarded as essentially zero, at least in the pressure range employed in this investigation.

## DISCUSSION

### NMR $T_1$ vs. Pressure

For all three membranes, there are two clear trends regarding the  $^1\text{H}$  NMR data: (i)  $T_1$  increases with increasing water content; (ii) the activation volume increases with decreasing water content. The first observation simply reflects the decreased water molecular mobility at lower water content, which enhances the relaxation by decreasing  $\tau_c$  toward the value of  $\omega^1$ . The second trend is similar to that exhibited by the conductivity and will be discussed in more detail later.

Briefly, at low water content water molecular relaxation requires some assistance from pendant chain motions, thus leading to increased activation volume. The activation volume at high water content, not surprisingly, approaches the value of liquid water (nearly zero in the current pressure range). The addition of  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  to water does not appreciably change the activation volume, as indicated in Figure X.

The  $^{19}\text{F}$  relaxation data exhibit no clear trends, that is,  $T_1$  is approximately independent of both water content and pressure. Given that over 80% of the fluorines reside in the relatively immobile (and, in the current pressure range, incompressible) PTFE backbone, this result is not entirely unexpected.

### Electrical Conductivity vs. Water Content

As mentioned above, Figure 2 shows that the electrical conductivity of all three equivalent weights of polymer are essentially the same when they contain the same amount of water though the NAFION 105 may be slightly higher. That is not particularly surprising for low water content since there is little difference between the polymers and it has been shown that at low water content, electrical

transport is governed by the polymer [13]. As will be shown in the next section, for high water content samples, the electrical conductivity is determined by the water itself and thus varying the equivalent weight should have little effect.

Next, it should be apparent that for a given number of water molecules per sulfonate, constant  $\lambda$ , NAFION 105 has the highest conductivity while NAFION 120 has the lowest. This is expected since NAFION 105 will have the most protons (charge carriers) per unit volume and NAFION 120 will have the least.

Finally, Figure 2 shows that as the water content increases, the electrical conductivity increases smoothly. This is important in that a "percolation threshhold" is not observed i.e. there is no concentration of water where an abrupt increase in the electrical conductivity is observed. Consequently, the phenomenon of static percolation is not observed in NAFION.

### **Electrical Conductivity vs. Pressure**

As has been previously shown [1,12,13], NAFION exhibits two well-defined regions, one for  $\lambda < 5$  (region i) and one for  $\lambda > 5$  (region ii). These two regions are correlated with the ability of NAFION to absorb water from the vapor phase [1]. Specifically, Zawodzinski et al. [1] found that for  $\lambda < 5$  water uptake occurs very slowly with increasing water vapor activity. This is the region corresponding to solvation of the proton and sulfonate ions. For  $\lambda > 5$  of Zawodzinski et al. [1]), the polymer begins to swell rapidly as the water content increases. Consequently, in this regime the water begins to fill the space between the polymer chains.

### **Activation Volume, Region (i)**

In a previous paper [13], it was shown that in region (i) the activation volume increases to very large positive values as the water content decreases. The new datum for NAFION 105, listed in Table I and plotted in Figures 4 and 6,

shows it also exhibits a large activation volume at low water content. It was pointed out [13] that those activation volumes are typical of the values observed in the widely studied solvent-free polymer electrolytes [16]. This suggested that in region (i) electrical transport is controlled by segmental motions of the polymer. In the usual model of NAFION at low water content, there are "clusters" of water molecules and ions separated by polymer. The model, then, is that for low water content NAFION, ions are moving through the amorphous polymeric regions between the "clusters" and it is the segmental motions of the polymer, presumably the pendant chains, which control this motion. The  $^1\text{H}$  NMR activation volumes are highest in region (i), although they do not rise to the extent that the conductivity values do as the water content is decreased. Again, this reflects the still dominant (even for  $\lambda \approx 3$ ) contribution of water molecular motion, including rotation, to the  $T_1$  process.

It is noted that this discussion of the activation volume assumes that there is no contribution from the formation of charge carriers i.e. it is assumed that high pressure does not generate any charge carriers. In fact, the temperature variation of the electrical conductivity supports this conclusion since it has been shown that the electrical conductivity in dry NAFION exhibits non-Arrhenius VTF or WLF behavior [20-22] and it is well known that VTF behavior is typical of ion motion controlled by segmental motion of the polymer. This is, of course, the case in the widely studied solvent-free polymer electrolytes [16]. Also, Xu and co-workers have found VTF or WLF behavior in other ion-exchange membranes [10,11,23]. In addition, there are other polymer electrolytes similar to NAFION (stiff backbones and flexible sidechains) which also exhibit VTF or WLF behavior [24,25]. In any of those cases, if the generation of charge carriers were dominant, the electrical conductivity would be expected to be Arrhenius. Consequently, it is concluded that for low water content NAFION, the change of the electrical

conductivity with pressure or temperature is attributable to changes in ion mobility only. Zawodzinski et al. [1] have also concluded that ionic mobility in low water content membranes is intimately tied to polymer motions.

The situation is not so clear for highly concentrated sulfuric acid. It is clear from either Table II or Figure 5 that a small, positive activation volume is found. It is tempting to again assign the positive activation volume to ion motion and assert that a small increase in volume is necessary for the ions to move through the sulfuric acid. However, as no data appear to exist concerning the variation of the dissociation constants or ionic concentration with pressure for concentrated sulfuric acid, no strong statement can be made at the present time. However, the large difference in the activation volumes for concentrated sulfuric acid and dry NAFION implies that there is little similarity between ion transport in the two materials.

#### Activation Volume. Region (ii)

It is clear from Figures 4 and 5 that for region (ii) the activation volume for NAFION as deduced from the electrical conductivity is negative i.e. the electrical conductivity increases as pressure increases. In a previous paper [13], it was suggested that the electrical conductivity in this region is controlled more by the water than by the polymer. This is, of course, consistent with the characteristics of region (ii) since there is a substantial amount of water between the polymer chains. The model, then, is that the protons move through the water, which contains extra protons from the polymer, and thus the conductivity would be expected to approach that for water or a dilute acid.

In fact, the activation volume for water is negative. For example, on the basis of early data, Conway [26] concluded that the volume of activation is between -2.4 and -2.9 cm<sup>3</sup>/mol. A more recent value as calculated from the data of

Hamann [27] and presented by Holzapfel [28] is  $-10.6 \text{ cm}^3/\text{mol}$ . Also, Quist et al. [29] found that for 0.002424 molal sulfuric acid at  $70^\circ\text{C}$ ,  $d\ln\sigma/dp=1.5/\text{GPa}$  which leads to a value of about  $-4.3 \text{ cm}^3/\text{mol}$ . Since none of these measurements on liquids were carried out under the conditions of the present work on NAFION, the present work on sulfuric acid solutions was carried out. It is obvious from Table I and Figure 5 that the volume of activation for the aqueous sulfuric acid solutions studied in the present work is consistent with the results from similar previous work. Specifically, the activation volumes for the acid studied in the present work are somewhat less negative than the value from Holzapfel which is in turn less negative than the value for pure water, that is, it follows the variation in concentration. Most importantly, as is apparent from Figure 5, the activation volumes for the acid at high water concentrations are similar to that for NAFION containing large amounts of water. This provides evidence that at room temperature the electrical conductivity in NAFION with high water content is similar to that for the equivalent sulfuric acid aqueous solution.

Consequently, the usual interpretation of proton motion in aqueous solutions at room temperature also apply to NAFION. Specifically, proton motion is usually interpreted in terms of transfer from a hydronium ion,  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ , to a water molecule [26]. It is straightforward to explain a negative activation volume in terms of this mechanism. The activation volume for ion motion is usually interpreted as the volume change when a diffusing species transfers from a "normal" position to an "activated" position (sometimes referred to as the "saddle point"). For this mechanism, the "normal" state consists of two parts, a hydronium ion and a water molecule. The "activated" state may be thought of as a single system, two water molecules sharing a proton. Because of the sharing, the "activated" state would be expected to have a smaller volume than the "normal" state hence the negative volume of activation.

However, this model for the activation volume for region (ii) assumes that there is no contribution from the formation (or destruction) of charge carriers i.e. it is assumed that high pressure does not change the number of charge carriers. In fact, that probably is not the case. For example, essentially all of the large negative activation volume for water is usually interpreted in terms of dissociation of the water molecules i.e. the increase of electrical conductivity with pressure is usually attributed to an increase in the dissociation constant [28]. Further discussion of this point is given below, however, it is clear that a more sophisticated model for the activation volume for region (ii) is necessary.

#### Effect of Pressure on the Electrical Conductivity, Region (i)

An alternative approach is to analyze the results in terms of the effect of pressure on the electrical conductivity. Specifically, the electrical conductivity in a liquid can written as [30]:

$$\sigma = (n_A z_A^2 \mu_A + n_B z_B^2 \mu_B) F^2 \quad (4)$$

where the  $\mu_A$  and  $\mu_B$  are the mobilities of ions A and B,  $n_A$  and  $n_B$  are the concentrations,  $z_A$  and  $z_B$  are the charge numbers and  $F$  is the Faraday constant. For the sake of simplicity, it will be assumed that there is only one type of charge carrier. In the case of NAFION, that is a good approximation since only one type of charge carrier is usually considered, protons, and this leads to the following approximation for the pressure dependence of the electrical conductivity:

$$\left( \frac{\partial \ln \sigma}{\partial p} \right)_T = \left( \frac{\partial \ln N}{\partial p} \right)_T + \chi_T + \left( \frac{\partial \ln \mu}{\partial p} \right)_T \quad (5)$$

where  $N$  is the number of charge carriers.

Further, the mobility can be rewritten in terms of viscosity,  $\eta$  via Stokes law:

$$\mu = \frac{N_A}{6\pi\eta r} \quad (6)$$

Equation (6) is based on the assumption that the size of the moving object is much larger than the size of the particles which make up the medium that it is moving through. Of course, this is not strictly valid for ions moving through NAFION, however, it provides a framework for discussing the effect of pressure on the electrical conductivity since equation (6) leads to:

$$\left( \frac{\partial \ln \sigma}{\partial p} \right)_T = \left( \frac{\partial \ln N}{\partial p} \right)_T + \chi_T - \left( \frac{\partial \ln \eta}{\partial p} \right)_T \quad (7)$$

Using either equations (5) or (7) it is straightforward to understand the large, negative pressure derivative of the electrical conductivity which is observed for low water content NAFION. As discussed above, the temperature variation of the electrical conductivity provides evidence that few carriers are generated as pressure increases. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that the first term on the right hand side of equations (5) or (7) is approximately zero. It could also be argued that pressure might increase the number of charge carriers since it is known that the dissociation constant of water increases as pressure increases [28] and thus the first term in equations (5) or (7) might be positive. Next, the second term on the right hand side of equation (5) or (7), the compressibility, is always positive. Consequently, the large decrease of electrical conductivity as pressure increases can be explained either by a large decrease in the mobility of the protons or a large increase in the viscosity of the medium. This is reasonable and is what is expected for normal materials. In fact, a large increase in viscosity with

pressure in polymers [31] is usually attributed to viscosity associated with segmental motions and thus proton motion in NAFION in region (i) can again be attributed to segmental motions.

Again, the situation is not so clear for highly concentrated sulfuric acid for which a small negative pressure derivative of the electrical conductivity is found. According to equations (5) or (7) the positive compressibility leaves approximately  $-1.0 / \text{GPa}$  to be explained by changes in the concentration of charges carriers and changes in either the mobility or viscosity with pressure. It is reasonable that viscosity should increase and hence mobility should decrease as pressure increases. Further, it is also reasonable that the number of charge carriers should increase with increasing pressure as it does for dilute sulfuric acid [29]. In this model, then, the first term on the right hand side of equations (5) and (7) is positive and hence the pressure derivative of the mobility or viscosity will be somewhat more negative than  $-1.0 / \text{GPa}$ . However, at the present time no data appear to exist concerning either the variation of the dissociation constants or ionic concentration or the behavior of the viscosity with pressure for concentrated sulfuric acid. Consequently, no definitive statements can be made concerning the relative contributions of ionic concentration or mobility to the pressure derivative of the electrical conductivity for concentrated sulfuric acid.

#### Effect of Pressure on the Electrical Conductivity, Region (ii)

As is apparent from Tables I and II, for NAFION in region (ii) and dilute sulfuric acid the logarithmic pressure derivative of the electrical conductivity (left hand side of equations (5) and (7) ranges from  $+0.51$  to  $+1.85 / \text{GPa}$ . Interestingly, a large fraction of this variation can be accounted for by the second term on the right hand side of equations (5) and (7), the isothermal compressibility which merely represents an increase in the concentration because the volume decreases

as pressure increases. While the exact value is not known, in both cases it is probably very close to 0.45/GPa which is the isothermal compressibility for water. That leaves from about +0.06 to +1.45/GPa to be accounted from by the effect of pressure on the number of ions and the mobility/viscosity.

As regards the first term in equations (5) and (7), the effect of pressure on the number of ions, it is most likely that the number will increase because, as pointed out above, it is well known that the dissociation constant of water increases as pressure increases [28]. However, the extent to which that is applicable to either the NAFION or sulfuric acid environment is not clear. In the case of NAFION, there are two sources of protons. Protons come either from the solvation of the sulfonate groups on the polymer and from the water itself. In the case of the sulfuric acid, again there are effectively two "sources" of protons since sulfuric acid contains two protons i.e. ionization of the first proton from sulfuric acid is different from the second ionization. Consequently, the number of protons for those systems is not known let alone the variation of pressure and thus all that can be said about the first term in equations (5) and (7) is that it may be positive.

However, the residual pressure derivative of the electrical conductivity can be explained by the third term in equations (5) and (7). If, for example, the number of ions increases strongly as pressure increases, it would require that the mobility decrease or the viscosity increase. In fact, under the thermodynamic conditions of the present work, 300K and 0.001 to 0.25 GPa, the viscosity of water is known to increase with pressure [32,33] and consequently the explanation would be straightforward. On the other hand, if the contribution due to the change in the number of ions with pressure were small, zero or even negative, it would require the mobility to increase or the viscosity to decrease as pressure increases. In fact, these are well known phenomena for water since in the early work [31,32], it was shown that below about 293K and 0.1 GPa, the viscosity of water does indeed

decrease with increasing pressure. This is interpreted as pressure breaking the local structure of water thereby making it easier for ion or molecular motion.

Again, at the conditions of the present work the viscosity actually increases with pressure. However, there is little doubt that water continues to have structure to relatively high temperatures [34] and that that structure will be broken by pressure. It is not inconceivable that a decrease in local water structure could cause an increase the mobility of ions with pressure yet not be strong enough to dominate the macroscopic viscosity i.e. it is possible for both the mobility of ions and the macroscopic viscosity to increase with pressure. The remainder of the increase in the electrical conductivity with an increase of pressure could then be accounted for by a more relevant relationship between the viscosity and the mobility. Obviously, further work concerning this point is necessary.

The  $^1\text{H}$  NMR relaxation is dominated by water molecular motion, particularly in region (ii). The pressure-induced generation of charge carriers (the first term in equations (5) and (7)), which clearly increases the conductivity, would not be expected to have a significant effect on  $T_1$ . That is, if negative activation volumes ( $T_1$  increasing with increasing pressure) were observed, this would most likely reflect mobility/viscosity effects. In fact, there is no evidence that the NMR activation volumes change sign as the water content of NAFION is increased, rather, they steadily approach zero, as is the case for the aqueous acid solutions. This tends to support the view that the first term in equations (5) and (7), i.e. charge carrier generation, is primarily responsible for the negative conductivity activation volume in high water content NAFION and dilute aqueous  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  solutions.

## CONCLUSIONS

In summary, then, several results have been obtained via measurements of the electrical conductivity for different molecular weight NAFION and various concentrations of sulfuric acid at high pressure. The electrical conductivity decreases with increasing pressure for concentrated sulfuric acid and low water content NAFION samples. This behavior (positive activation volumes) is that expected for "normal" liquids and for ions in polymers where the motion of the ions is determined by segmental motions of the polymer. However, for high water contents in both NAFION and sulfuric acid, the reverse is true. The electrical conductivity increases with increasing pressure which gives rise to a negative activation volume. The results show that at high water contents, the electrical conductivity mechanism in NAFION is essentially identical to that for a dilute acid where the transport is controlled by the aqueous component. These conclusions are supported by proton NMR  $T_1$  measurements, which yield decreasing activation volumes with increasing water content, approaching the value obtained for aqueous  $H_2SO_4$  solutions.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the U.S. Office of Naval Research and the PSC-CUNY Research Awards Program. The authors would like to thank Walther Grot of DuPont de Nemours for supplying the NAFION 120 and 105 samples. They also thank Mr. Dale McLachlan for assistance with the NMR measurements.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Zawodzinski, Jr., T. A.; Derouin, C.; Radzinski, S.; Sherman, R. J.; Smith, V. T.; Springer, T. E.; Gottesfeld, S. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **1993**, *140*, 1041.
- [2] Zawodzinski, Jr., T. A.; Neeman, M.; Sillerud, L. O.; Gottesfeld, S. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1991**, *95*, 6040.
- [3] Wodski, R.; Narebska, A.; Nioch, W. K. *J. Appl. Poly. Sci.* **1985**, *30*, 769.
- [4] Fontanella, J. J.; McLin, M. G.; Wintersgill, M. C.; Greenbaum, S. G. *Solid State Ionics* **1993**, *66*, 1.
- [5] Deng, Z. D.; Mauritz, K. A. *Macromolecules* **1992**, *25*, 2369.
- [6] Slade, R. C. T.; Barker J.; Strange, J. H. *Solid State Ionics* **1989**, *35*, 11.
- [7] Yeo, R. S. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **1983**, *130*, 533.
- [8] Uosake, K.; Okazaki, K.; Kita, K. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **1990**, *287*, 163.
- [9] Zaluski, C. S.; Xu, G. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **1994**, *141*, 448.
- [10] Xu, G.; Pak, Y. S. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **1992**, *139*, 2871.
- [11] Cahan, B.; Wainright, J. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **1993**, *140*, L185.
- [12] Chen, R. S.; Stallworth, P. E.; Greenbaum, S. G.; Fontanella, J. J.; Wintersgill, M. C. *Electrochim. Acta* **1995**, *40*, 309.
- [13] Fontanella, J. J.; Wintersgill, M. C.; Chen, R. S.; Wu, Y.; Greenbaum, S. G.; *Electrochim. Acta* **1995**, *40*, 2321.
- [14] Starkweather, H. W.; Chang, J. J. *Macromolecules* **1982**, *15*, 752.
- [15] Edmondson, C. A.; Fontanella, J. J.; Wintersgill, M. C.; Gerace, F.; Scrosati, B; Greenbaum, S. G. *Solid State Ionics*, to be published.
- [16] Fontanella, J. J.; Wintersgill, M. C.; Smith, M. K.; Semancik, J.; Andeen, C. G. *J. Appl. Phys.* **1986**, *60*, 2665.
- [17] Polymer Handbook, eds. J. Brandrup, J. and E. H. Immergut, E. H., John Wiley and Sons: New York, 1975.

- [18] J. Chem. Eng. Data **1967**, *12*, 67.
- [19] Chen, R. S.; Jayakody, J. P.; Greenbaum, S. G.; Pak, Y. S.; Xu, G.; McLin, M. G.; Fontanella, J. J. J. Electrochem. Soc. **1993**, *140*, 889.
- [20] Fontanella, J. J.; M. G. McLin, M. G.; Wintersgill, M. C. J. Polym. Sci. B: Polym. Phys. **1994**, *32*, 501.
- [21] Williams, M. L.; Landel, R. F.; Ferry, J. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1955**, *77* 3701.
- [22] Vogel, H. Phys. Z. **1921**, *22*, 645.; Tammann, V. G.; Hesse, W. Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem. **1926**, *156*, 245.; Fulcher, G. S. J. Am. Ceram. Soc. **1925**, *8*, 339.
- [23] Zahreddine, C.; Pak, Y. S.; Xu, G. Solid St. Ionics **1992**, *58*, 185.
- [24] Inoue, K.; Nishikawa, Y.; and Tanigake, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1991**, *113* 7609.
- [25] Foo, C.; McBreen, J.; Xu, Z.; Okamoto, Y. *Polymer Advanced Technologies*, John Wiley and Sons, to be published.
- [26] Conway, B.E. in *Modern Aspects of Electrochemistry No. 3*, eds. Bockris, J. O'M.; Conway, B. E. Butterworths, Washington, 1964, p. 117.
- [27] Hamann, S. D. J. Phys. Chem. **1963**, *67*, 2233.
- [28] Holzapfel, W. B. J. Chem. Phys. **1969**, *50*, 4424.
- [29] Quist, A. S.; Marshall, W. L.; and Jolley, H. R.; J. Phys. Chem. **1965**, *69*, 2726.
- [30] Koryta, J. *Ions, Electrodes and Membranes*, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1982).
- [31] Ferry, J. D. *Viscoelastic Properties of Polymers*, Wiley, New York (1961).
- [32] Horne R. A.; Johnson, D. S. J. Phys. Chem. **1966**, *70*, 2182.
- [33] Bett, K. E.; Cappi, J. B. Nature **1965**, *207*, 620.
- [34] Nemethy, G; Scheraga, H. A. J. Chem. Phys. **1962**, *36*, 3382.

**Table I.** Effect of pressure on the electrical conductivity for various forms of NAFION with different water content at room temperature.

Wt-% H <sub>2</sub> O	$\lambda$	$\frac{\partial \ln G}{\partial p}$	$\frac{\chi T}{3}$	$\frac{\partial \ln \sigma}{\partial p}$	$\Delta V$
		(GPa) <sup>-1</sup>	(GPa) <sup>-1</sup>	(GPa) <sup>-1</sup>	(cm <sup>3</sup> /mol)
<b>NAFION 105</b>					
2.8	1.6	-5.76	0.1	-5.66	+13.9
28.2	15.7	0.44	0.15	0.59	-1.45
<b>NAFION 117</b>					
2.7	1.6	-4.76*	0.1	-4.66	11.4
3.5	2.1	-4.02*	0.1	-3.92	9.63
3.5	2.1	-4.06*	0.1	-3.96	9.72
4.0	2.4	-2.85*	0.1	-2.75	6.74
4.5	2.7	-2.80**	0.1	-2.70	6.63
5.6	3.4	-2.15*	0.1	-2.05	5.02
5.6	3.4	-2.15,-2.28*	0.1	-2.05,-2.18	5.02,5.34
7.4	4.5	-1.18**	0.1	-1.08	2.63
16.4	10	0	0.15	0.15	-0.37
22.9	14	0.41	0.15	0.56	-1.38
24.5	15	0.29	0.15	0.44	-1.08
29.5	18	1.70	0.15	1.85	-4.55
<b>NAFION 120</b>					
2.4	1.6	-6.54*	0.1	-6.44	15.8
2.8	1.9	-6.06*	0.1	-5.96	14.6
4.1	2.7	-3.09*	0.1	-2.99	7.33
4.2	2.8	-3.05*	0.1	-2.95	7.23
6.9	4.6	-1.02,-1.22*	0.1	-0.92,-1.12	2.24,2.73
15.8	10.5	0.41	0.15	0.56	-1.38

\*Reference 13.

\*\*Reference 12.

**Table II.** Effect of pressure on the electrical conductivity for various aqueous solutions of sulfuric acid at room temperature.

Wt-% H <sub>2</sub> O	$\lambda$	$\frac{\partial \ln G}{\partial p}$ (GPa) <sup>-1</sup>	$\frac{\chi T}{3}$ (GPa) <sup>-1</sup>	$\frac{\partial \ln \sigma}{\partial p}$ (GPa) <sup>-1</sup>	$\Delta V$ (cm <sup>3</sup> /mol)
-----------------------	-----------	--	---	---	--------------------------------------

SULFURIC ACID/WATER SOLUTIONS

0	-0.75	0.15	-0.60	+1.48
2.2	0	0.15	+0.15	-0.37
9.6	0.54	0.15	+0.69	-1.70
14.8	0.80	0.15	+0.95	-2.34

**Table III.** NMR Activation volume.

Wt-% H<sub>2</sub>O       $\lambda$        $\Delta V$

(cm<sup>3</sup>/mol)

**NAFION 105**


4	2.3	5.0 ± 0.2
10	5.7	3.6 ± 0.2
27	15.4	2.6 ± 0.3

**NAFION 117**


4	2.4	4.8 ± 0.4
10.4	6.2	3.5 ± 0.3
20.8	12.3	0.5 ± 1.0

**NAFION 120**


3	2.0	4.5 ± 0.4
8.7	5.8	2.8 ± 0.3
18	12.0	0.3 ± 1.0




**Figure 1.** Complex impedance diagrams at two pressures for NAFION 105 containing 2.8 wt-% ( $\lambda=1.6$ ) of water. The solid squares (0.284 GPa) and open circles (0.136 GPa) represent datum points obtained using a CGA-83 Capacitance bridge. The frequencies increase from right to left and the maximum frequency for that bridge is  $10^5$  Hz.




**Figure 2.** Electrical conductivity vs. water content for various samples of NAFION 105, 117 and 120 at room temperature (about 298 K).




**Figure 3.** Relative electrical conductance vs. pressure at room temperature (about 298 K) and various pressures for NAFION 117 containing of water. The circles represent a high water content sample,  $\lambda=18$  waters per sulfonate and the squares represent a low water content sample,  $\lambda=3.4$  waters per sulfonate. Also shown are the best-fit straight lines.




**Figure 4.** Activation volume vs. water content in Wt-% for various samples of NAFION 105, 117 and 120 at room temperature (about 298 K).




**Figure 5.** Activation volume vs. water content in  $\lambda$ , which is the number of waters per sulfonate, for various samples of water in sulfuric acid and NAFION 105, 117 and 120 at room temperature (about 298 K).




**Figure 6a.** Proton NMR  $T_1$  vs. pressure for various water concentrations in NAFION 105.




**Figure 6b.** Proton NMR  $T_1$  vs. pressure for various water concentrations in NAFION 117.




**Figure 6c.** Proton NMR  $T_1$  vs. pressure for various water concentrations in NAFION 120.



**Figure 7a.** Fluorine-19 NMR  $T_1$  vs. pressure for various water concentrations in NAFION 105.



**Figure 7b.** Fluorine-19 NMR T<sub>1</sub> vs. pressure for various water concentrations in NAFION 117.



**Figure 7c.** Fluorine-19 NMR  $T_1$  vs. pressure for various water concentrations in NAFION 120.